

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Mitt

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/029,553	12/20/2001	Matthew J. Birdsall	P105 CON 3	6097
28390	7590 10/14/2003		EXAMINER	
MEDTRONIC AVE, INC. 3576 UNOCAL PLACE			THALER, MICHAEL H	
	A, CA 95403		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3731	
			DATE MAILED: 10/14/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
7	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	10/029,553	BIRDSALL ET AL.
·	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael Thaler	3731
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 08 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application application (ation. A proper reply to a h
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offictimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>08 September 2003</u> 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.
NOTE:		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	· · · ——	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: 20-25,28,31,32 and 36-41.		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8.⊠ The proposed drawing correction filed on <u>08 Septe</u> Examiner.	ember 2003 is a)⊠ approved or	b) disapproved by the
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	
10. Other:		april h
		Michael Thaler Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3731





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: claim 39 remains rejected under 35 USC 112, 2ND paragraph since it was not canceled. Further, no arguments were even presented in the reply filed 9/8/03 as to why this rejection is considered improper. Alt et al. is not limited to an oval cross-section but includes any rounded cross-section (col. 14, lines 17-20). Thus, the rounded cross section which results from the rounding of the corners of either primary reference but which leaves flat sides is not inconsistent with Alt et al..